



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,415	11/14/2003	Sherman (Xuemin) Chen	15225US01	2739
23446	7590	07/02/2008	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD				CHAI, LONGBIT
500 WEST MADISON STREET				
SUITE 3400				
CHICAGO, IL 60661				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2131
				MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
				07/02/2008 PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory

1. Examiner notes please use this one as the corrected Advisory response if two different versions of Advisory has been received by Applicant.
2. As per claim 1, 11, 21 and 35, Applicant asserts (a) Testardi does not teach generating of an output key from multiple input keys (Remarks: Page 23, 1st Para) and (b) Testardi does not teach a method for generating a security key for a printer device (Remarks: Page 23, Last Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding (a), According to MPEP § 2145, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, Examiner notes one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986) —This is because the prior-art Sprunk (NOT the Testardi reference) does teach “generating a first output key based on said at least said first input key, said second input key and said third input key (i.e. from multiple input keys)” – please refer to refer to Final Office action submitted on 4/22/2008. Regarding (b), Testardi teaches a electronic security key which is correlated with an unique serial number is used to enable the printer’s premium functionality (Testardi: Column 8 Line 18 – 25, Column 6 Line 29 – 31 / 49 – 51) and as such Testardi does teach generating a security key is indeed used for a printer device.
3. As per claim 31 and 45, Applicant asserts (a) Sprunk’s DES generator is not a mapper (Remarks: Page 17, 2nd Para) and (b) even if a scrambler and a mapper were present in Sprunk, the elements by themselves would not constitute the Applicant's limitation,

expressly stating that the scrambler is "coupled" to the mapper (Remarks: Page 19, 2nd Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding (a), Sprunk teaches double-dual stages DES operation (Sprunk: Figure 4) and the DES operations constituted with substitution / permutation / swapping functional stages along with the key hashing function, as shown in Figure 4, is qualified to provide mapping / scrambling functions to meet the claim limitations as recited in the claim. Regarding (b), according to the definition of Dictionary.com, "to couple" can be interpreted such as "to join, or to connect" and Sprunk teaches a mapper (Sprunk: Figure 4 / Element 420 / 425 and Para [0036]) is connected to a scrambler (Sprunk: Figure 4 / Element 450 / 455 / 456 and Para [0039]) through an AND gate and as such Sprunk teaches a scrambler coupled to said mapper. Applicant's argument has no merit since the alleged limitation such as (a) a scrambler directly coupled to said mapper and (b) a masker directly coupled to said mapper have not been recited into the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).